

C.) Remarks

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended.

The rejection of claims 11-15 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, the rejection of claims 21-24 as being indefinite, and the rejection of claims 11-24 as being unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) in view of Janes et al (Janes) in view of Decker, Jr. et al (Decker) are respectfully traversed.

Claim 21 recites a "plurality of fibre coating sections" and claim 22 cites "fibre coating sections" so these independent claims clearly require more than one fibre coating section. Claim 21 also specifies that at least some of the fibre coating sections are adhered to one of the core plate faces, whereas claim 22 requires the fibre coating sections to be arranged on the core plate. In both cases, however, some of the sections are required to be spaced by gaps from other sections. The reference in claim 21 to the gaps is not new matter; the original specification previously was amended on page 7, line 24 to refer specifically to the gap and the gaps are included in claim 22.

With respect to the rejection of claims 21-24 as being indefinite by the inclusion of the phrase "at least some of said sections" it is not believed this expression is indefinite for the reason that there could be several sections contiguous to one another yet spaced from others. It is believed the statement that at least some of the sections are spaced from one another is a precise and definite recitation.

However, should the examiner still object she is respectfully to suggest alternative language.

The provisional rejection of claims 11-15 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting is respectfully traversed. These claims were provisionally rejected in view of claims 11-24 of "copending Application No. 09/935,973" in view of Sheehan and Decker. The serial number of the application referred to in the rejection is the serial number of the present application. The reference to Sheehan is to a patent which is not of record. Applicant's attorney telephoned Examiner Lockett on April 22, 2003 and referred to these two matters. The examiner stated it would not be necessary to respond to the double patenting rejection unless the examiner called the attorney with appropriate information concerning the application on which the provisional rejection is based and that the mention of the Sheehan patent was in error and should have referred to the patent to Jane. The examiner also stated that, if this amendment is submitted before the examiner has an opportunity to identify the companion application on which the double patenting rejection is based, a further double patenting rejection would not result in a final action. Thus far, the examiner has not communicated further with applicant's attorney.

Applicant has two other co-pending applications, namely, Serial Nos. 09/935,972 and 09/935,975. Neither of these applications, however, includes claims numbered 11-24.

It is respectfully submitted that Janes neither discloses nor suggests a single layer fibre coating the fibres

of which are multidirectional. Janes does disclose a compression molded composite sheet of multiple layers of epoxy impregnated graphite fibres. The fibres of each layer, however, are unidirectional. See Figure 8, and column 5, lines 4-16 of Janes. The lack of a disclosure in Janes of multidirectional fibres is acknowledged in the last line of page 3 of the outstanding official letter. However, the examiner apparently relies upon Besnainou as disclosing plates having multidirectional fibres and refers to Figure 6 in support of that position. It is respectfully submitted that Besnainou does not disclose that for which it was cited.

Besnainou discloses a plurality of superposed sheets A, B, C, D, . . . of carbon fibres pre-impregnated with a polymerizable resin, and such sheets are so arranged that the fibres of one sheet cross the fibres of adjacent sheets at selected angles. One of these sheets has fibres 10, another sheet has fibres 12, and another sheet has fibres 14. Still other sheets have fibres 11 and 13. See column 2, lines 27-41. It is clear from Figure 5 and the cited portion of the specification that the fibres of each layer are unidirectional, rather than multidirectional, as is required by claim 11. Further, Besnainou teaches multiple layers or sheets overlying one another and arranging the sheets in such manner that the unidirectional fibres of one sheet extend at an angle to the direction in which the unidirectional fibres of an adjacent sheet extend. See column 1, lines 33-45. This is in marked contrast to applicant's claimed construction wherein a core plate has adhered thereto a plurality of single

layer fibre coating sections, the fibres of each coating section being so arranged as to be multidirectional. In Besnainou the fibres of each layer are unidirectional. Multidirectionality is attained only by stacking the layers in such manner that the fibres carried by one layer extend in a direction other than the direction in which the fibres of the adjacent layer extend.

From the foregoing analysis of the disclosures of the Janes, Decker, and Besnainou references it is apparent that the prior inventors considered it necessary in the production of a multidirectional arrangement of fibres to provide a plurality of laminations of unidirectional fibres and arrange alternate laminations in such manner that the stacked laminations together produce a multidirectional arrangement of fibres. Not one of the Janes, Decker, or Besnainou references of record even remotely suggests the provision of a single layer coating within which are embedded fibres that are multidirectional, rather than unidirectional. This significant concept has been contributed to the art by applicant, and only by applicant.

Each of claims 12-20 depends, ultimately, on claim 11 and, accordingly, distinguishes over the references for the same reasons given in support of the parent claim.

Claim 21 does not necessarily require the fibres of each fibre coating section to be multidirectional, but it does specify that at least some of these sections are spaced by gaps from others thereof. This gap arrangement is neither disclosed nor suggested by the prior art of record.

Claim 22 recites a core plate sandwiched between and adhered to fibre coating sections each of which has a plurality of embedded elongate fibres, and the fibres of at least some of such sections are recited as being multidirectional. Since there is no disclosure or suggestion in the prior art of a fibre-bearing section in which the fibres are multidirectional, it is respectfully submitted that claim 22 is allowable over the prior art.


Each of claims 23 and 24 depends on claim 22 and distinguishes over the latter by reciting certain characteristics of applicant's construction in more detail.

It is believed this application is in condition for allowance. Such action is requested.

The Office is authorized to charge or refund any fee deficiency or excess to Deposit Account No. 50-2676.

Respectfully submitted,

Martin Schleske  
By his attorney,

  
Registration No. 17,452  
John K. McCulloch  
5291 Colony Drive North  
1st Floor  
Saginaw, Michigan 48603  
989-792-2500